

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments in claims 1, 9 and 10 are intended to define the invention with enhanced specificity to distinguish more clearly over the art of record.

The present invention, as defined by claims 1-7, 9, 10, 33 and 34, relates to an "information communication device" that is used in the management of a "target device" such as a copier by a remote managing device (e.g. a server 12 at head office E in Fig. 4). Claim 8 relates to a "remote management system" that also manages a "target device." The communication provided by this device and system is by email.

Information about the target device is collected at the target device and sent by a "transmission processing section" of the "information communication device" as an attachment to the email. The transmission processing section converts the collected device information into the attached data. It also transmits it via an email "when device information could be sent to the managing device." (Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 33, and 34).

This last "when" point distinguishes over the prior art systems noted in the Background of the Invention section, e.g. at page 5, lines 2 to 13, that repeatedly send target machine information. It also distinguishes, *inter alia*, over the Karim reference of record which transmits files in response to commands from a "source control engine" 102. This is true whether an attached file is sent from the engine in connection with a "check in" command, or back to the server as an attachment to an "acknowledgement email" in response to a "check out" command from the engine 102.

In the present invention, whether defined by original claim 8 or defined in the amended claims 1, 9 and 10, the "when" of the transmission of the collected information is controlled by the transmission processing section of the information control unit. This is new. Support for the amendment in claims 1, 9 and 10 can be found at least on page 35, lines 5-14.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-10, 33 and 34 under 35 USC 102(e) as fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,654,892 to Karim (hereinafter "Karim").

Karim teaches a method and apparatus "for enabling document access across a firewall." (Abstract, lines 1-2; Col. 2, lines 5-6). As stated succinctly in the "Summary" section (Col. 2, lines 6-7 and lines 11-12) "[t]his is accomplished via a document access request on the first side of the firewall." (Emphasis supplied.) The request "specifies a document control command [e.g. "check in" or "check out"] and an associated file name." On "check in," an email may have attached to it a file such as source code. On "check out," the requested file can be supplied as an email attachment. This operation is described in more detail at Col. 4, line 48 to Col. 5, line 3 cited by the Examiner, as well as the cited passage at Col. 5, line 50 to Col. 6, line 25, but it is basically a requested file transfer across a firewall.

Karim is not merely a different use of the same structure defined by Applicants' claims. The Karim reference, for example, does not teach or suggest the management of a "target device," as claimed. It does not teach or suggest that any device on the "second" side of the firewall (distal from the source control engine 102 on a "first" side) determine "when device information should be sent to the managing device." Nor does Karim teach or suggest that "information collected about a management target device" be converted, on the "second" side, into "attached data." Nor does it teach or suggest that the Karim "Source Control Engine" 102 or "Client Interface Engine" 104 manage a "target device." The Karim engines simply retrieve designated files from the opposite side of a firewall, or send a file to the other side of the firewall for a "check in." A user may modify and then return a retrieved file, but this modification is not the claimed collection and transmission, as an attachment, of information about a managed target device.

Independent claim 8 recites a managing device that performs remote management of said management target device based on the device information contained in the electric mail. Karim fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

The attachment to the email in Karim is a document that is requested by a user. For example, such a document may be source code that the user wishes to work on. Upon receiving such a document, the user works on the document, updates the

document, and sends the document back to be stored in the server. Hence while the document may be managed, Karim does not disclose that the server is managed based on the attached document. Claim 8 is therefore novel and inventive over Karim for at least this reason.

Applicants note that the Examiner has questioned whether the corrected Supplemental IDS filed February 23, 2005 was necessary, as the original Supplemental IDS was correct as filed on January 27, 2005. A copy of the first page of Japanese Publication No. 2707459 accompanies this Amendment. The original Supplemental IDS gives a publication date of "07-03-1990." The document, at "(45)", upper left, reads: "(1998) 1 ... 28...". This is understood to be the publication date. It is shown on the PTO form used in the corrected Supplemental IDS as "01-28-1998." This corrected IDS is therefore believed to differ from the original one in the date, and to be correct.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants urge that the pending claims define clear patentable differences over the art of record, and that this application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Manus

Registration No.: 26,766

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 439-4444

Attorney for Applicant